

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-43, 45-57, 78-81 are all the claims pending in the application and elected for prosecution.

Claims 1, 20, 26, 38, 46, 51, 56 and 78 are amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 13-23, 25, 46-53, 55-57 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berthoud et al. (“Berthoud”) in view of Jain et al. (“Jain”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because even if the teachings of the references were combined as asserted in the Office Action, the combination would not include all the limitations recited in the claims.

Claim 1, for example, recites in step (c) “sending a request for the person’s preferred point of contact information, the request including at least a portion of the universal point of contact identifier identifying the person and including a contact type identifier identifying a type of contact requested from among a plurality of types of contact.” In particular, the claim recites the request including “a contact type identifier identifying a type of contact requested from among a plurality of types of contact.” Neither Berthoud, nor Jain, alone or in combination, teach or suggest including in a request for a person’s preferred point of contact information, a contact type identifier that identifies a type of contact requested among a plurality of types of contact.

Berthoud merely discloses, as shown for example in Fig. 2, inputting an email address (104), encoding the email address (106), alerting a central office of a pending encoded transmission (108), transmitting, receiving and decoding the email address at the central office (110 and 112), and the central office determining the telephone number from the email address (114). Berthoud does not teach or suggest that a request for a person’s preferred point of contact

information includes a contact type identifier identifying a type of contract requested from among a plurality of types of contact.

Jain is cited for disclosing choosing a preferred contact number. Jain concerns a call sequencing method that enables a user to specify a sequence of telephone numbers along with a set of parameters that enable the system to adaptively order the call sequence. Jain describes that a customer can specify alternate telephone numbers for use in the call sequence, based on certain conditions, such as the time of day the call is made. For example, calls made between 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. are directed to the customer's business telephone number. See col. 1, lines 25-42.

Neither Berthoud nor Jain, alone or in combination, teach or suggest including in a request a contact type identifier identifying a type of contact requested from among a plurality of types of contact. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if the teachings of Berthoud and Jain were combined as asserted in the Office Action, the combination would not include all the limitations of claim 1. Since the combination does not contain all the limitations in claim 1, the combination does not render claim 1 unpatentable, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

The remaining independent claims that are pending in the application also relate to including in a request for a person's preferred contact information a contact type identifier identifying a type of contact requested from among a plurality of types of contact. Accordingly, the asserted combination does not render those claims unpatentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 3, 10, 12, 24, 26-43, 45, 54 and 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berthoud and Jain and further in view of Bottan et al. ("Bottan"). Paragraph [0159] of Bottan is cited for teaching that a plurality of contact information can be stored. Specifically, in the Office Action it is asserted that Bottan discloses in paragraph [0159],

storing a plurality of contact information (e.g., fax number, email address, etc.) in a database. In the Office Action it is asserted that it would have been obvious to use such a database in the combined Berthoud/Jain system because it allegedly would have been obvious to “have as much contact information as possible, again, in order to increase the likelihood of establishing a connection with the intended target of the call.” See Office Action at page 4.

Bottan describes, in paragraph [0159], that a subscriber to a notification service can specify that certain recipients receive a notification message in response to the occurrence of a particular event. See also Bottan paragraph [0010]. When the particular event occurs, a notification is sent to a recipient the subscriber specifies in advance. The recipient’s contact information is held in a database and can include a variety of methods for contacting the recipient, such as by telephone, fax or email. See paragraph [0159]. Bottan states, in paragraph [0159] that the “subscriber may define one or more methods for each [recipient], with less direct mechanisms being used only if a more direct method is unsuccessful.”

Bottan, however, either alone or in combination with Berthoud and Jain, does not teach including in a request for a person’s preferred contact information a contact type identifier identifying a type of contact requested from among a plurality of types of contact. Although Bottan describes storing a variety of contact information for a recipient of a notification message, Bottan does not describe requesting any particular type of contact information. Rather, Bottan merely describes using whatever contact information resides in the database to send a notification to the recipient. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if Berthoud and Jain were modified to include the database of Bottan, the combination would not include all the limitations of the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Warren Lytle, Jr./

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

J. Warren Lytle, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,283

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 2, 2007